

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is requested. Claims 25-26 and 28-45 are in this application. Claims 1-24 and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 25, 29, 32, and 34-35 have been amended. Claims 39-45 have been added to alternately and additionally claim the present invention.

Applicant has concurrently submitted substitute drawings under separate cover in accordance with 37 CFR §1.121(b)(3). Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate whether these substitute drawings have been accepted. Applicant notes that in the next communication following receipt of the drawings, applicant is to be notified by the Examiner if the drawings have been entered and, if not entered, applicant should receive an explanation as to why the drawings were not entered. (See MPEP §608.02(h).)

Applicant also requests the Examiner to consider, initial, and return to applicant a copy of the 1449 Form submitted with the supplemental IDS filed on December 20, 2004.

The Examiner entered an Examiner's Amendment to claims 21, 32, and 34, and page 15 of the specification. The changes made by the Examiner are reflected in the present claims as having already been made. Further, the changes to the specification are treated as having already been made. In addition, the Examiner stated that, "[f]or clarification purpose, the applicants indicate . . ." Applicants note that the specific structures identified, which were discussed during the telephone interviews on January 17 and 19 as providing support for the required claim elements, are intended to be examples of the required claim elements.

The Examiner rejected claims 20-24 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehrotra et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,686,300) in view of Erb (U.S. Patent No. 4,247,916). As noted above, claims 20-24 have been cancelled. In addition, claim 29 has been amended to depend from claim 25.

The Examiner objected to claims 25-28 and 32-38 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 25 has been amended to be in independent form, and is believed to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In addition, claim 25 has been amended to further clarify the claim. Claims 32, 34, and 35 were also amended to add further clarity. Claims 26, 28, and 32-38 were not amended to be in independent form as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from claim 25.

With respect to new claim 39, this claim recites, in part:

“a plurality of gate strips formed over the channel strips between source strips and drain strips, the plurality of gate strips being isolated from the plurality of channel strips, each gate strip having a serpentine shape.”

Thus, new claim 39 requires that each gate strip have a serpentine shape. (Support for the serpentine shape limitation can be found in applicant's FIG. 6A, which shows each gate strip 632, 636, and 642 with a serpentine shape.)

However, from what can be determined, neither the Mehrotra nor the Erb reference show gate strips which have serpentine shapes. As a result, new claim 39 is patentable over Mehrotra in view of Erb. In addition, since claims 40-45 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 39, claims 40-45 are patentable over Mehrotra in view of Erb for the same reasons as claim 39.

10/824,270

PATENT

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4-8-05

By: Mark C. Pickering

Mark C. Pickering  
Registration No. 36,239  
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300  
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300  
Telephone: (707) 762-5500  
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504  
Customer No: 33402

AMENDMENT IN RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL  
ACTION MAILED JANUARY 21, 2005

Atty. Docket No. 100-19410  
(P05247-D01)